

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

DEBRA COBLE,)	
)	
Appellant,)	Case No. ALLO-99-0010
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING
)	HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE
DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,)	DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR
)	
Respondent.)	

Hearing on Exceptions. Pursuant to RCW 41.64.060 and WAC 358-01-040, this matter came on for a hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, LEANA D. LAMB, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated March 30, 1999. The hearing was held on February 11, 2000, in the Personnel Appeals Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, and GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, reviewed the record and participated in the decision in this matter.

Appearances. Appellant Debra Coble was present and represented herself *pro se*. Respondent Department of Corrections (DOC) was represented by Tom Banyard, Personnel Manager.

Background. Appellant was a Roster Manager and her position was allocated to the Administrative Assistant 3 classification. Effective July 22, 1999, Appellant's position was reallocated to the Correction Unit Supervisor classification. Respondent determined that because Appellant's reallocation was a correction of a long-term inequity, she should retain status in the position and her salary should be adjusted according to the rules of promotion as provided by WAC 356-10-050(5).

1 Appellant appealed that decision to the Department of Personnel (DOP) stating that her salary
2 should have been adjusted in accordance with WAC 356-10-050(4) which provided for adjusting an
3 incumbent's salary after reallocation to the same step in the new range as held in the present range.
4 The Director's determination was issued on March 30, 1999 and concluded that Appellant's salary
5 was properly adjusted according the rules of promotion.

6
7 On April 23, 1999, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director's determination with the Personnel
8 Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding. In summary, Appellant
9 takes exception to the determination that her salary was properly adjusted using the rules governing
10 promotions.

11
12 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant argued that she had been performing higher level
13 Roster Manager duties for a number of years and that because her duties had not changed, her
14 reallocation should have not been considered a promotion. Appellant concedes that her reallocation
15 was not the result of a Department of Personnel designated class study. However, Appellant asserts
16 that there had been a lot of talk about a class study but that nothing was done to resolve the
17 recognized allocation inequities for the Roster Managers. Appellant argues that while Respondent
18 may have technically followed the rules, her salary adjustment using the rules for promotions was
19 not fair.

20
21 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent argues that the provisions of WAC 356-10-
22 050(4) are followed only when the reallocation is based on a revision of a class series, a class series
23 study, or a classification review that is planned, conducted or authorized by the Department of
24 Personnel. Respondent asserts that there was no class study conducted and that it correctly
25 followed WAC 356-10-050(5) when adjusting Appellant's salary following her reallocation to the
26 existing class of Correctional Unit Supervisor.

1
2 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director’s determination that Appellant’s salary was properly adjusted
3 as provided in WAC 356-10-050(5) should be affirmed.
4

5 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
6 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
7 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that
8 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in
9 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular
10 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the
11 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.
12 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).
13

14 WAC 356-10-050 sets forth how employees are affected by the upward reallocation of their
15 positions. Under section 4, the employee retains status in the position and the employee’s salary is
16 adjusted to the same step in the new range as held in the present range when the reallocation is
17 “based on a revision of a class series, a class study, or an agency-wide or major subdivision-wide
18 classification review planned, conducted, or authorized by the department of personnel in advance
19 of personnel board action (if any), when the reallocation involves no change in duties or
20 responsibilities.” Under section 5, when the reallocation is a correction of a long-term inequity, the
21 employee’s salary is adjusted in accordance with the rules governing promotion.
22

23 In Aarthun et al., v. Dep’t of Community, Trade and Economic Development and Dept of
24 Personnel, PAB Case No. V94-082 (1996), *affirmed* Thurston County Superior Court No. 96 2
25 00803 3 (1998), the Board concluded that only the director of the Department of Personnel or
26 his/her designee has the authority to grant “class study” status to a classification development

1 project. In Aarthun, such authorization was neither requested by the agency nor granted by the
2 Department of Personnel and the Board found no merit system rule governing unauthorized or
3 implied class studies. The Board concluded that without Department of Personnel authorization as
4 an official "class study," the provisions of WAC 356-10-050(4) did not apply.

5
6 Appellant's reallocation was not the result of a classification revision. Furthermore, here, as in
7 Aarthun, the Department of Personnel did not authorize an official class study. Therefore, the
8 provisions of WAC 356-10-050(4) do not apply.

9
10 **Conclusion.** The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied and the Director's
11 determination dated March 30, 1999, should be affirmed and adopted.

12
13 **ORDER**

14 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is
15 denied and the Director's determination dated March 30, 1999, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is
16 attached.

17 DATED this _____ day of _____, 2000.

18
19 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

20
21 _____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

22
23 _____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

24
25 _____
Leana D. Lamb, Member

26
Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504